**UNITED NATIONS** **E**

**Economic and Social Council**

Distr.
GENERAL

E/CN.4/1996/SR.34
16 April 1996

Original: ENGLISH

COMMISSION ON HUMAN RIGHTS

Fifty-second session

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 34th MEETING

Held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,
on Thursday, 11 April 1996, at 10 a.m.

Chairman: Mr. VERGNE SABOIA (Brazil)

CONTENTS

STATEMENT BY THE MINISTER FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS OF GUATEMALA

FURTHER PROMOTION AND ENCOURAGEMENT OF HUMAN RIGHTS AND FUNDAMENTAL FREEDOMS, INCLUDING THE QUESTION OF THE PROGRAMME AND METHODS OF WORK OF THE COMMISSION:

(a) ALTERNATIVE APPROACHES AND WAYS AND MEANS WITHIN THE UNITED NATIONS SYSTEM FOR IMPROVING THE EFFECTIVE ENJOYMENT OF HUMAN RIGHTS AND FUNDAMENTAL FREEDOMS;

(b) NATIONAL INSTITUTIONS FOR THE PROMOTION AND PROTECTION OF HUMAN RIGHTS;

This record is subject to correction.

Corrections should be submitted in one of the working languages. They should be set forth in a memorandum and also incorporated in a copy of the record. They should be sent within one week of the date of this document to the Official Records Editing Section, room E.4108, Palais des Nations, Geneva.

Any corrections to the records of the public meetings of the Commission at this session will be consolidated in a single corrigendum, to be issued shortly after the end of the session.

GE.96-11988 (E)

CONTENTS (continued)

(c) COORDINATING ROLE OF THE CENTRE FOR HUMAN RIGHTS WITHIN THE UNITED NATIONS BODIES AND MACHINERY DEALING WITH THE PROMOTION AND PROTECTION OF HUMAN RIGHTS;

(d) HUMAN RIGHTS, MASS EXODUSES AND DISPLACED PERSONS (continued)

ADVISORY SERVICES IN THE FIELD OF HUMAN RIGHTS (continued)

QUESTION OF THE VIOLATION OF HUMAN RIGHTS IN THE OCCUPIED ARAB TERRITORIES, INCLUDING PALESTINE (continued)

THE RIGHT OF PEOPLES TO SELF-DETERMINATION AND ITS APPLICATION TO PEOPLES UNDER COLONIAL OR ALIEN DOMINATION OR FOREIGN OCCUPATION (continued)

IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROGRAMME OF ACTION FOR THE THIRD DECADE TO COMBAT RACISM AND RACIAL DISCRIMINATION (continued)

QUESTION OF THE REALIZATION IN ALL COUNTRIES OF THE ECONOMIC, SOCIAL AND CULTURAL RIGHTS CONTAINED IN THE UNIVERSAL DECLARATION OF HUMAN RIGHTS AND IN THE INTERNATIONAL COVENANT ON ECONOMIC, SOCIAL AND CULTURAL RIGHTS, AND STUDY OF SPECIAL PROBLEMS WHICH THE DEVELOPING COUNTRIES FACE IN THEIR EFFORTS TO ACHIEVE THESE HUMAN RIGHTS, INCLUDING:

(a) PROBLEMS RELATED TO THE RIGHT TO ENJOY AN ADEQUATE STANDARD OF LIVING; FOREIGN DEBT, ECONOMIC ADJUSTMENT POLICIES AND THEIR EFFECTS ON THE FULL ENJOYMENT OF HUMAN RIGHTS AND, IN PARTICULAR, ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE RIGHT TO DEVELOPMENT;

(b) THE EFFECTS OF THE EXISTING UNJUST INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC ORDER ON THE ECONOMIES OF THE DEVELOPING COUNTRIES, AND THE OBSTACLES THAT THIS REPRESENTS FOR THE IMPLEMENTATION OF HUMAN RIGHTS AND FUNDAMENTAL FREEDOMS (continued)

The meeting was called to order at 10.15 a.m.

STATEMENT BY THE MINISTER FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS OF GUATEMALA

1. Mr. STEIN BARILLAS (Guatemala) said that a new era had begun in his country. Things were changing, and changing for the better. The decisions and actions of his Government, in place for barely three months, clearly demonstrated that something new was happening. Efforts were being made to realize the hopes upon which the Government had been elected: to bring security and peace to the country and to combat impunity, discrimination and privileges; to improve the standard of living and to modernize the system of government. Miracles could not be worked in 10 weeks but the initial results were visible.

2. His Government was striving to achieve a well-rounded realism which entailed public recognition of past and present failures and a search for practical and realistic solutions. The shared responsibility for that effort must of necessity be generated gradually out of assessments made both within the country and without. The effort must involve society as a whole, and not the Government alone for, if society itself did not take on the task of reconciliation and reconstruction, no political force could do so on its behalf.

3. One of the most urgent items on his Government's agenda was the peace process. When as a candidate, the new President had decided to meet in secret with the Unidad Revolucionaria Nacional Guatemalteca (URNG), the negotiations had taken on a momentum resulting in substantial progress. Results were gradually being achieved in other areas as well, including the transformation of security institutions, legal matters, infrastructure and health.

4. He himself, as a public office-holder, was naturally enthusiastic about the Government's pluralistic policies but did not harbour false illusions concerning Guatemala's internal divisions. If the nation was to be governable, serious efforts to achieve reconciliation were required. It needed to mature as a society in an atmosphere of tolerance, respect and cooperation: the social fabric was deeply torn and there were still cases of patent injustice. But Guatemala was gradually coming to grips with the urgent need to reconcile domestic conflicts, including intransigent ethnic divisions.

5. Though Guatemalan society was still profoundly racist, there was a growing awareness of the potential contribution to be made by indigenous populations and of the fact that their cultural richness must be treated with respect and given room to blossom. The past conflict must not be replaced by an even more intractable one such as those to be found in regions where ethnically or religiously motivated armed confrontations were causing massive loss of life.

6. The Commission had for years been contributing substantially to the improvement of the human rights situation in Guatemala, particularly by the appointment of a succession of special rapporteurs. The Group of Friends of the Guatemalan peace process had also played an important role in the negotiation and cooperation efforts. The work of the United Nations Mission

for the Verification of Human Rights and of Compliance with the Commitments of the Comprehensive Agreement on Human Rights in Guatemala (MINUGUA) had helped to increase the technical support for the justice system.

7. All those endeavours had acquired their own momentum and opportunities were opening to make significant progress in areas where it had previously seemed impossible. There was a growing movement towards organized involvement of citizens in social and political affairs and major steps towards national reconciliation had been taken. For precisely those reasons, Guatemala should remain under consideration in the context of the advisory services in the field of human rights, and his Government reiterated its invitation to the Centre for Human Rights to dispatch a technical mission there.

8. His Government attached the highest importance to the peace process and the successful outcome of negotiations with the URNG. Those who opposed negotiation as a means of resolving the long-standing conflict must state frankly that they wanted the war to continue and more blood to be spilled. The Government would do its utmost to proceed along the road to peace and the strengthening of democratic society. It would honour the agreements that had already been signed and was determined to attain, slowly but surely, a social and institutional situation approximating ever more closely to full respect for human rights.

FURTHER PROMOTION AND ENCOURAGEMENT OF HUMAN RIGHTS AND FUNDAMENTAL FREEDOMS, INCLUDING THE QUESTION OF THE PROGRAMME AND METHODS OF WORK OF THE COMMISSION:

(a) ALTERNATIVE APPROACHES AND WAYS AND MEANS WITHIN THE UNITED NATIONS SYSTEM FOR IMPROVING THE EFFECTIVE ENJOYMENT OF HUMAN RIGHTS AND FUNDAMENTAL FREEDOMS;

(b) NATIONAL INSTITUTIONS FOR THE PROMOTION AND PROTECTION OF HUMAN RIGHTS;

(c) COORDINATING ROLE OF THE CENTRE FOR HUMAN RIGHTS WITHIN THE UNITED NATIONS BODIES AND MACHINERY DEALING WITH THE PROMOTION AND PROTECTION OF HUMAN RIGHTS;

(d) HUMAN RIGHTS, MASS EXODUSES AND DISPLACED PERSONS

(agenda item 9) (continued) (E/CN.4/1996/8, 42, 43, 44, 45 and Add.1, 46, 47, 48 and Add.1, 49, 50 and Add.1, 51, 52 and Add.1 and 2, 53 and Add.1 and Corr.1 and Add.2, 105, 109, 116, 117, 137 and 148; E/CN.4/1996/NGO/4, 10, 20, 28, 31, 34, 37, 43, 47, 51, 56, 64 and 75; A/50/332 and 685; A/CONF.177/20; E/CN.4/1995/48; E/CN.6/1996/11)

ADVISORY SERVICES IN THE FIELD OF HUMAN RIGHTS (agenda item 17) (continued) (E/CN.4/1996/11, 14, 15, 89, 90, 92, 93 and Add.1, 94, 111, 118 and Add.1, 136 and 138; E/CN.4/1996/NGO/38 and 74; A/50/482, 681 and Add.1, and 878; A/49/929)

9. Ms. PARKER (International Educational Development, Inc.) said she welcomed the report of the Special Rapporteur on violence against women concerning Japan's war rape victims (E/CN.4/1996/53/Add.1) and was appalled

that the Japanese Government had yet to pay them compensation. Though aware of plans to distribute not less than 2 million yen per victim through a private fund, her organization was not convinced that it met Japan's international responsibility to compensate its victims. The Government of Germany, for example, had established a wide range of compensation programmes, including direct payments and pensions, contributions to private foundations and contributions to funds established by Israel.

10. Ms. PAPANDREOU (International Educational Development, Inc.) said that the effect of severe economic sanctions on the condition of women in Iraq had been catastrophic and had resulted in hunger, illness and anxiety. In contrast with her organization's previous visits to Iraq, it had recently found there a weak economy, a physically debilitated people and crime, unemployment and prostitution. The Iraqi people was consuming less than half the food and only one eighth the medicine that had been customary before the war. A nearly 550 per cent increase in the mortality rate of children under five had occurred since 1990.

11. Her organization deemed it abominable that the United Nations should issue blueprints for universal human rights standards and simultaneously adopt resolutions containing the recipe for atrocities in the form of economic sanctions and asked the Special Rapporteur on violence against women to evaluate the impact of economic sanctions on the situation of women in Iraq. The representative of the Secretary-General on internally displaced persons should likewise investigate the large-scale displacements of population in Iraq.

QUESTION OF THE VIOLATION OF HUMAN RIGHTS IN THE OCCUPIED ARAB TERRITORIES, INCLUDING PALESTINE (agenda item 4) (continued) (E/CN.4/1996/L.3, 6 and 12)

12. Mrs. FERRARO (United States of America), speaking in explanation of vote before the voting, said that her delegation was unable to support the draft resolution on human rights in the occupied Syrian Golan (E/CN.4/1996/L.3) because the one-sided nature of the language used could only complicate the peace process. The issues raised by that draft resolution were best left to the ongoing negotiations between the parties and should not be prejudged by the Commission. Her delegation could not support either the draft resolutions contained in documents E/CN.4/1996/L.6 and E/CN.4/1996/L.12, in which a similar approach was taken.

13. Her delegation was disappointed to note that the draft resolutions submitted under agenda item 4 at the current session had not changed from previous years, despite the clear advances in the peace process, and that the Commission had once again before it five separate, unbalanced, draft resolutions on the situation in the Middle East. The Commission could best help the people of the Middle East by focusing on the progress which the peace process had made and by recognizing that peace offered the best opportunity to further human rights for everyone in the region.

14. She requested that the vote on the draft resolution contained in document E/CN.4/1996/L.3 be taken by roll-call.

15. Mr. TORELLA di ROMAGNANO (Italy), speaking in explanation of vote before the voting on behalf of the European Union, said that the Union would abstain on the draft resolutions on the violation of human rights in the occupied Arab territories, including Palestine (E/CN.4/1996/L.6), on human rights in the occupied Syrian Golan, (E/CN.4/1996/L.3) and on the situation in occupied Palestine (E/CN.4/1996/L.7). The sponsors of those draft resolutions had seen fit to re-submit texts which, in both content and form, more or less reproduced the texts submitted at the Commission's fifty-first session, which had not been adopted by consensus and on which the Union had abstained. The new texts failed to take into account both the changes that had taken place in the territories and the progress made in the peace negotiations, which could help to create the right conditions for the full respect of human rights.

16. The Union regretted that the draft resolutions contained no reference to the observations of the Special Rapporteur on the Palestinian territories occupied since 1967 or to the recommendations made in his report (E/CN.4/1996/18), especially his recommendation that his mandate should be updated to make it easier to establish a constructive dialogue with all the parties concerned.

17. Lastly, the Union regretted the absence of a clear condemnation of the acts of violence to which it had referred in its statement on agenda item 4.

18. For all those reasons, the Union had no choice but to abstain on the draft resolutions contained in documents E/CN.4/1996/L.3 and E/CN.4/1996/L.6, submitted under agenda item 4. It would also have to abstain on the draft resolution on the situation in occupied Palestine (E/CN.4/1996/L.7), submitted under agenda item 7.

Draft resolution on human rights in the occupied Syrian Golan (E/CN.4/1996/L.3)

19. Mr. KHOURY (Syrian Arab Republic), introducing the draft resolution, said that the delegations of Bangladesh, Cuba, Indonesia, Malaysia and Pakistan and the observers for Bahrain and Saudi Arabia had joined the list of sponsors. After highlighting the main points of the draft resolution, he expressed the hope that it would be adopted without a vote. However, if a vote was called for, it should be taken by roll-call. There were a number of mistakes in the Arabic and French versions; he would hand in corrections to the Secretariat.

20. The vote was taken by roll-call.

21. Bulgaria, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Algeria, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Chile, China, Colombia, Cuba, Egypt, Ethiopia, India, Indonesia, Malaysia, Mauritania, Mexico, Nepal, Pakistan, Philippines, Republic of Korea, Sri Lanka, Uganda, Venezuela, Zimbabwe.

Against: United States of America.

Abstaining: Angola, Australia, Austria, Belarus, Benin, Brazil, Bulgaria, Cameroon, Canada, Côte d'Ivoire, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, France, Gabon, Germany, Guinea, Hungary, Italy, Japan, Madagascar, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Peru, Russian Federation, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

22. The draft resolution was adopted by 22 votes to 1, with 28 abstentions.

Draft resolution on the question of the violation of human rights in the occupied Arab territories, including Palestine (E/CN.4/1996/L.6)

23. Mr. LEMINE (Mauritania) introduced the draft resolution on behalf of its sponsors. After drawing attention to the salient points, he expressed the hope that it would receive broad support in the Commission.

24. Mrs. PAZ CAMPOS (Mexico), speaking in explanation of vote before the voting, said that her delegation would vote in favour of the draft resolution, although it did not agree with certain points and the language used was not at all balanced. A reference to the need to stop terrorist acts wherever they occurred would have been desirable.

25. The CHAIRMAN said that the representative of the United States of America had requested a vote, and the representative of Cuba a roll-call vote.

26. The vote was taken by roll-call.

27. Cameroon, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Algeria, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Brazil, Chile, China, Colombia, Cuba, Egypt, Ethiopia, Gabon, Guinea, India, Indonesia, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Nepal, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Republic of Korea, Sri Lanka, Uganda, Venezuela, Zimbabwe.

Against: Russian Federation, United States of America.

Abstaining: Angola, Australia, Austria, Belarus, Benin, Bulgaria, Cameroon, Canada, Côte d'Ivoire, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, France, Germany, Hungary, Italy, Japan, Madagascar, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

28. The draft resolution was adopted by 27 votes to 2 with 23 abstentions.

Draft resolution on Israeli settlements in the occupied Arab territories (E/CN.4/1996/L.12)

29. Mr. TORELLA di ROMAGNANO (Italy), introduced the draft resolution on behalf of the European Union and its other sponsors. After summarizing its contents, he expressed the hope that it would be adopted without a vote.

30. Mr. MÖLLER (Secretary of the Commission) announced that the observer for New Zealand wished to be added to the list of sponsors.

31. The CHAIRMAN informed the Commission that the representative of the United States had requested a vote by show of hands.

32. The draft resolution was adopted by 49 votes to 1, with 3 abstentions.

33. Mr. MALGUINOV (Russian Federation) said that, despite its endorsement of many of the provisions contained in the draft resolution, his delegation had voted against it because it did not fully reflect the complexity of the situation and the contradictory processes involved. The Commission must promote the peace process and should denounce violations of human rights regardless of which side was responsible for such violations.

THE RIGHT OF PEOPLES TO SELF-DETERMINATION AND ITS APPLICATION TO PEOPLES UNDER COLONIAL OR ALIEN DOMINATION OR FOREIGN OCCUPATION (agenda item 7) (continued) (E/CN.4/1996/L.7, 8, and 9)

Draft resolution on the situation in occupied Palestine (E/CN.4/1996/L.7)

34. Mr.BEBARS (Egypt), introducing the draft resolution on behalf of its sponsors, said that the text was a model of clarity and concision. Highlighting its main points, he noted that the text had been inspired, inter alia, by the Charter of the United Nations and resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council. The text emphasized the right of the Palestinian people to self-determination, without external interference. He hoped that the Commission would adopt the draft resolution by consensus.

35. Mr. MÖLLER (Secretary of the Commission) announced that the observer for Morocco had become a sponsor of the draft resolution.

36. The CHAIRMAN said that the representative of the United States of America had requested a vote.

37. At the request of the representative of Egypt, the vote was taken by roll-call.

38. El Salvador, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Algeria, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Brazil, Chile, China, Colombia, Côte D'Ivoire, Cuba, Egypt, Ethiopia, Gabon, Guinea, India, Indonesia, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Nepal, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Republic of Korea, Sri Lanka, Uganda, Venezuela, Zimbabwe.

Against: United States of America.

Abstaining: Angola, Australia, Austria, Belarus, Benin, Bulgaria, Cameroon, Canada, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, France, Germany, Hungary, Italy, Japan, Madagascar, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Russian Federation, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

39. The draft resolution was adopted by 28 votes to 1, with 23 abstentions.

Draft resolution on the question of Western Sahara (E/CN.4/1996/L.8)

40. The CHAIRMAN, introducing the draft resolution, said that its text had been prepared after consultation with interested delegations and was based on previous resolutions on the same topic. If he heard no objection, he would take it that the Commission wished to adopt it without a vote.

41. It was so decided.

42. Mr. BENJELLOUN-TOUIMI (Observer for Morocco) said that the resolution just adopted was an almost exact copy of the resolution on the same subject adopted by the General Assembly on 6 December 1995; in addition, the Security Council had adopted five resolutions on the subject in the past two years. In the interests of efficiency, he wondered if the Commission should continue to adopt resolutions on questions already dealt with by other bodies.

43. Mr. MEGHLAOUI (Algeria) said it was unfortunate that the observer for Morocco should publicly call into question the decision of the Commission to adopt the resolution. The Commission was duty-bound to consider the question of Western Sahara as it involved the right of a people to self-determination. His own delegation had joined the consensus on the text as a means of seeking a solution to the problem.

Draft resolution on the Middle East peace process (E/CN.4/1996/L.9)

44. Mrs. FERRARO (United States of America), introducing the draft resolution on behalf of its sponsors, said that the text stressed the importance of achieving a comprehensive, just and lasting settlement of the Middle East conflict, which was the best way to advance the cause of human rights for all in the region. It would take a great deal of work and wisdom to heal the wounds and begin the slow process of building peace.

45. In the past four years, Palestinians and Israelis had made great progress in resolving their differences and working out practical solutions to a complicated set of problems. It was therefore vital that the Commission should support the objectives of the recent summit meeting of the peacemakers and should condemn terrorist attacks, which sought to undermine the peace process and were the work of the enemies of peace, desperate individuals endeavouring to revive the hatreds of the past for their own twisted purposes.

46. The draft resolution demonstrated the Commission's commitment to peace and human rights throughout the Middle East and would, she hoped, be adopted by consensus.

47. Mr. MÖLLER (Secretary of the Commission) announced that the delegations of India and Nepal and the observers for Finland, Greece, Ireland and Romania had become sponsors of the draft resolution.

48. The draft resolution was adopted without a vote.

49. Mr. BERNARD (France) said that his Government welcomed the progress made thus far in the peace process, which it had always supported, and condemned the acts of violence committed by extremists on all sides. It hoped that the peace process, based on the principle of the exchange of land for peace, could be completed in 1996.

50. Efforts must be devoted to reaching an agreement on the final status of the Palestinian territories and settlements between Israel and Syria and between Israel and Lebanon. In that connection, his Government was particularly interested in the fate of Lebanon and in the restoration of Lebanese sovereignty over its entire territory, within internationally recognized borders. It regretted that the draft resolution failed to mention Security Council resolution 425 (1978), which provided the only lasting means for ending tension and guaranteeing security in the area, and had thus been unable to sponsor the draft resolution. A just, lasting and global peace in the Middle East must be based on the relevant Security Council resolutions.

IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROGRAMME OF ACTION FOR THE THIRD DECADE TO COMBAT RACISM AND RACIAL DISCRIMINATION (item 12 of the agenda) (continued) (E/CN.4/1996/L.14, E/CN.4/1996/L.22, E/CN.4/1996/L.24, E/CN.4/1996/L.35)

51. The CHAIRMAN said that the consideration of draft resolutions E/CN.4/1996/L.22, L.24 and L.35 would have to be postponed, because the texts were not yet available in all the official languages.

Draft resolution on implementation of the Programme of Action for the Third Decade to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination (E/CN.4/1996/L.14)

52. Mr. NDIAYE (Observer for Senegal), introducing the draft resolution on behalf of its sponsors, which had been joined by the delegations of France and the Philippines, reviewed its contents highlighting, in particular, the need for financial resources to support the Programme of Action for the Third Decade to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination.

53. He said that paragraph 4 should be replaced by the following text:

> "Encourages States to limit the extent of any reservation they lodge to the Convention and to formulate any reservation as precisely and as narrowly as possible, while ensuring that no reservation is incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention or otherwise contrary to international law".

The wording was identical with that of paragraph 8 of General Assembly resolution 50/137 of 21 December 1995.

54. In paragraph 17, the word "Welcomes" should be replaced by "Takes note of".

55. Mr. van WULFFTEN PALTHE (Netherlands) said that it would facilitate the Commission's work if sponsors making changes from the floor would distribute them in writing beforehand so that members could see what they were adopting.

56. Mr. MÖLLER (Secretary of the Commission) announced that the delegations of Cameroon, Ecuador, Pakistan, the Republic of Korea and Sri Lanka and the observers for Honduras and Turkey had become sponsors of the draft resolution.

57. Explaining the administrative and programme budget implications of the draft resolution in accordance with rule 28 of the rules of procedure, he said that the resources required to implement the activities of the Third Decade to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination during the biennium 1996-1997 were expected to come from the voluntary contributions under the trust fund for the programme of the decade. Accordingly, the draft resolution would not, if adopted, give rise to additional requirements under section 21 (human rights) of the programme budget for the biennium 1996-1997.

58. The draft resolution was adopted without a vote.

59. Mr. NDIAYE (Observer for Senegal) asked whether the resources for the implementation of the activities provided for by the resolution would come from the regular programme budget of the United Nations or from a voluntary fund.

60. Mr. MÖLLER (Secretary of the Commission) said that there were funds earmarked for the implementation of the Third Decade in the programme budget for the current biennium. Any additional costs of implementing the resolution would have to come from voluntary contributions under the trust fund for the programme of the decade.

61. Mr. ALFONSO MARTINEZ (Cuba) asked whether the explanations of the financial and programme budget implications of the various draft resolutions submitted to the Commission would always be given orally or whether, at some stage, they would be provided in writing.

62. Mr. MÖLLER (Secretary of the Commission) said that the practice in past years had been for the financial implications to be indicated orally before action was taken on the draft resolution in question.

63. Mr. van WULFFTEN PALTHE (Netherlands), supported by Mr. ALFONSO MARTINEZ (Cuba), said that the Secretariat should be more specific and inform the Commission what amount had been earmarked for the Third Decade in the programme budget for the biennium 1996-1997.

64. Mr. MÖLLER (Secretary of the Commission) said that a written record of the financial implications would be issued as an annex to the Commission's report. He was not currently in a position to provide the information requested but would consult the Department of Administration and Management and inform the Commission as soon as possible.

QUESTION OF THE REALIZATION IN ALL COUNTRIES OF THE ECONOMIC, SOCIAL AND CULTURAL RIGHTS CONTAINED IN THE UNIVERSAL DECLARATION OF HUMAN RIGHTS AND IN THE INTERNATIONAL COVENANT ON ECONOMIC, SOCIAL AND CULTURAL RIGHTS, AND STUDY OF SPECIAL PROBLEMS WHICH THE DEVELOPING COUNTRIES FACE IN THEIR EFFORTS TO ACHIEVE THESE HUMAN RIGHTS, INCLUDING:

(a) PROBLEMS RELATED TO THE RIGHT TO ENJOY AN ADEQUATE STANDARD OF LIVING; FOREIGN DEBT, ECONOMIC ADJUSTMENT POLICIES AND THEIR EFFECTS ON THE FULL ENJOYMENT OF HUMAN RIGHTS AND, IN PARTICULAR, ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE RIGHT TO DEVELOPMENT;

(b) THE EFFECTS OF THE EXISTING UNJUST INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC ORDER ON THE ECONOMIES OF THE DEVELOPING COUNTRIES, AND THE OBSTACLE THAT THIS REPRESENTS FOR THE IMPLEMENTATION OF HUMAN RIGHTS AND FUNDAMENTAL FREEDOMS

(agenda item 5) (continued) (E/CN.4/1996/L.5 and 18)

Draft resolution on human rights and unilateral coercive measures (E/CN.4/1996/L.5)

65. Mr. MÖLLER (Secretary of the Commission) said that, although no E/CN.4/1996/L.5/Rev.1 had been produced, a purely technical change needed to be made to the draft resolution to indicate the fact that two States members of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries - Côte d'Ivoire and South Africa - were not sponsors.

66. After a procedural discussion in which Mr. SERY (Côte d'Ivoire), Mrs. CARRIZOSA DE LOPEZ (Colombia), Mr. LEGAULT (Canada), Mr. BERNARD (France) and Mr. ALFONSO MARTINEZ (Cuba) took part, the CHAIRMAN invited the representative of Colombia to introduce the draft resolution.

67. Mrs. CARRIZOSA DE LOPEZ (Colombia), introducing the draft resolution on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations that were members of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries and China, apart from Côte d'Ivoire and South Africa, noted that the draft resolution did not seek unnecessary confrontations. It called, inter alia, upon all States to refrain from adopting unilateral measures which created obstacles to trade relations among States or impeded the full realization of all human rights and rejected the application of such measures as tools of political or economic pressure because of their negative effects on the most vulnerable sectors of the population.

68. The CHAIRMAN said that the representative of the United States had asked for the draft resolution to be put to the vote.

69. At the request of the representative of Cuba, the vote was taken by roll-call.

70. Angola, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Algeria, Angola, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Brazil, Cameroon, Chile, China, Colombia, Cuba, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Gabon, Guinea, India, Indonesia, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Nepal, Nicaragua, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Sri Lanka, Uganda, Venezuela, Zimbabwe.

Against: Australia, Austria, Bulgaria, Canada, Denmark, France, Germany, Hungary, Italy, Japan, Netherlands, Republic of Korea, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Belarus, Côte d'Ivoire, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Malawi, Russian Federation, Ukraine.

71. The draft resolution was adopted by 32 votes to 14, with 7 abstentions.

Draft resolution on human rights and extreme poverty (E/CN.4/1996/L.18)

72. Mr. BERNARD (France), introducing the draft resolution on behalf of its sponsors, which had been joined by the delegations of the Côte d'Ivoire, Egypt and Pakistan and the observers for the Czech Republic and Nepal, said that the draft resolution reiterated that the eradication of widespread poverty and the full enjoyment of economic, social and cultural as well as civil and political rights were interrelated objectives and recalled the commitments entered into at the Copenhagen Conference. That was of particular significance in the International Year for the Elimination of Poverty and on the eve of the first United Nations Decade for the Elimination of Poverty. He hoped that the draft resolution could be adopted by consensus.

73. There was a mistake in the first line of the seventh preambular paragraph: General Assembly resolution 48/719 should be replaced by 48/183. In the eleventh preambular paragraph, the phrase "by a target date to be specified by each country" should be inserted after the words "eradicating absolute poverty".

74. Mr. MÖLLER (Secretary of the Commission) announced that the delegations of Angola, Australia, Bangladesh, Cameroon, Ecuador, Mali, Pakistan, Republic of Korea, Uganda and Zimbabwe and the observers for Equatorial Guinea, Finland, Switzerland and Uruguay had become sponsors of the draft resolution.

75. Explaining the administrative and programme budget implications of the draft resolution in accordance with rule 28 of the Commission's rules of procedure, in the draft resolution he said that the resources required to implement the resolution (US$ 47,000) would be provided from within existing provisions for the Economic and Social Council mandates under section 21 (human rights) of the approved programme budget for the biennium 1996-1997. Accordingly, no additional resources would be required.

76. The draft resolution was adopted without a vote.

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.